

**REMARKS**

The Office Action of February 27, 2003 has been reviewed, and the Examiner's comments carefully considered.

Claims 1-25 are currently pending in this application. Claims 5 and 13-15 have been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended to distinguish further over the prior art. Additionally, new claims 16-25 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-12, and 16-25 remain in this application. Support for all amendments to the claims can be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. No new subject matter is believed to have been added by this amendment.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections:**

Claims 1-11 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 6,046,762 to Sonesh et al. (hereinafter "the Sonesh patent"). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections.

Applicant believes that the Examiner is misconstruing a substantive term of claim 5, which if properly construed, should result in allowable subject matter.

With reference to canceled claim 5, the substance of which is now added to claim 1, the specification of the present invention specifically mentions that the sensors are located outside of the computer. (Page 3, lines 30-32.) Furthermore, the present invention's use of sensors refers to sensors, such as proximity and limit switches, configured to sense environmental changes (Page 4, lines 14-15; Page 9, lines 5-6) and act accordingly. For example, the sensors provide signals that can trigger cameras to turn on or off (Page 8, lines

4-8). The Sonesh patent does not even mention the term "sensor," let alone disclose such external sensors as required by amended claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of canceled claim 5, specifically providing for an input connection and an output connection that are electronically linked to the capture workstation, wherein the input connection is configured to receive a first signal from a sensor and the output connection is configured to transmit a second signal to an external device, such as a camera. New claim 16 further limits the sensor and new claim 17 limits the type of external device of claim 1. New claim 18 limits the type of video materials.

New method claim 19 sets forth a process for creating recorded video materials. New claim 20 limits the first signal as being generated by a proximity sensor. New claim 21 mirrors new claim 17. New claims 22 and 23 correspond verbatim to canceled claims 14 and 15, respectively. New method claim 24 adds a limitation of storing information pertaining to the recorded video images in a database. New method claim 25 corresponds to new system claim 19.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant believes that the subject matter of amended independent claim 1 and new claim 19 is not anticipated by the Sonesh patent. Claims 2-3, 6-12, and 16-18 depend from and add further limitations to amended independent claim 1 and are believed to be patentable in connection with amended independent claim 1.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections:**

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 6,046,762 to Sonesh et al. in view of the Examiner taking Official Notice that the use of a printer in a computer is a standard accessory that can be added for convenience for printing displayed information. Claim 12 depends from and adds a further limitation to

Patent Application No. 09/444,356  
Paper Dated June 27, 2003  
Reply to USPTO Correspondence of February 27, 2003  
Attorney Docket No. 2138-991562

amended independent claim 1 and is believed to be patentable for the same reasons stated in connection with amended independent claim 1.


**CONCLUSION**

Applicant explicitly reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of canceled claims 5 and 13-15, as well as other subject matter disclosed in this application, in a continuing application.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant believes that claims 1-4, 6-12, and 16-25 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections and allowance of the aforementioned claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WEBB ZIESENHEIM LOGSDON  
ORKIN & HANSON, P.C.

By   
John W. McIlvaine  
Registration No. 34,219  
Attorney for Applicant  
700 Koppers Building  
436 Seventh Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818  
Telephone: (412) 471-8815  
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094  
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com